

REMARKS

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner:

(1) rejected claims 1-54 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention;

(2) rejected claims 1-8, 26-32, 46 and 56-57 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade (<http://www.lonet.net~tslade/chinball.thm>) ("Slade") in view of Leason et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,866,776 ("Leason")), along with Moriyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,082,089) ("Moriyama");

(3) rejected claims 9-16, 20-21, 44-45 and 58-59 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view of Mencher-Aliazzo (U.S. Patent No. 5,779,652) ("Mencher-Aliazzo");

(4) rejected claims 17-18 and 60 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view of Nesbitt et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,616,550) ("Nesbitt");

(5) rejected claims 22-25 and 51-54 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view of Burnham (U.S. Patent No. 5,725,484) ("Burnham");

(6) rejected claims 33-40 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view of Mencher-Aliazzo;

(7) rejected claims 41-42 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view of Nesbitt;

(8) rejected claims 47-48 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view

of Kobayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0013849) ("Kobayashi");

(9) rejected claims 49-50 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slade, Leason and Moriyama, and further in view of Holland et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0175100);

(10) objected to claim 19 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; and

(11) indicated that claims 43 and 55 are allowed.

Turning first to Item 11 above, Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 43 and 55 are allowed.

In response to Item 10 above, Applicant has amended claim 19 in order to rewrite this claim in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim (i.e., claim 1). Applicant believes that claim 19 is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant has also (i) amended claims 4, 6, 16, 17 and 20-22 so that claims 4, 6-8, 16-18 and 20-25 now depend from claim 19, either directly or indirectly; (ii) amended claims 28, 30, 40, 41 and 44-51 so that claims 28, 30-32, 40-42 and 44-54 now depend from claim 43, either directly or indirectly; and (iii) amended claims 56-60 so that these claims now directly depend from claim 55. These claims are believed to be allowable, at least through dependency.

Additionally, Applicant has canceled claims 1-3, 5, 9-15, 26, 27, 29 and 33-39.

In response to Items 1 through 9 above, these rejections are believed to be moot in view of the foregoing amendments.

Lastly, Applicant has amended claim 43 to correct a typographical error found by Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that this patent application is now in condition for allowance and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

In the event that any fees may be required in this matter, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0221.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Margaret M. Slezak", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Margaret M. Slezak

Registration No. 55,625

Pandiscio & Pandiscio, P.C.

470 Totten Pond Road

Waltham, MA 02451-1914

Tel. No.: (781) 290-0060

MMS/STEINICIP.AMD

STEIN-1 CIP